

## Letters to the Editor

of the synopsis, neither the heading nor the conclusions stated in the synopsis were or could be concluded from the original study. I am concerned about the disparity. The study compared the results of one hour of Bobath and a half hour of Bobath plus a half hour of treadmill training. It is as if the synopsis used algebra to simplify the conclusions of the study:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \text{ Bobath} + \frac{1}{2} \text{ treadmill} &> 1 \text{ Bobath} \\ \frac{1}{2} \text{ treadmill} &> \frac{1}{2} \text{ Bobath} \end{aligned}$$

Therefore:  
treadmill  $>$  Bobath

Although important aspects of the study are included in the synopsis, I would have hoped that both the heading and conclusions in CAPs would represent the studies accurately. As a clinician I found this study very interesting and relevant and would recommend anyone working in this field to read the original article. For APA members the original article is available through the APA website.

**Sue Fitch**

*Private Practice, Queensland*

## References

- Eich HJ, Mach H, Werner C and Hesse S (2004): Aerobic treadmill plus Bobath walking training improves walking in subacute stroke: A randomized controlled trial. *Clinical Rehabilitation* 18: 640–651.
- Elkins M and Moseley A (2005): Treadmilling training more effective than Bobath training in improving walking following stroke. *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy* 51: 192.

## Response

We thank Ms Fitch for raising her concern about an apparent inconsistency between the CAP summary and the sentence she has cited from the original paper. We agree that our statement could not be derived from the cited sentence. However, both it and the heading may legitimately be derived from the detail provided in the methods section of the original paper.

In the original methods section, the authors describe a series of interventions that were common to both groups: 30 min of Bobath walking training, Bobath occupational therapy, speech therapy, neuropsychology, and all the assessment procedures. In addition, the experimental group received 30 min of aerobic treadmill training while the comparison group received an extra 30 min of Bobath walking training.

Randomised trials tell us about the effects of the elements that *differ* between groups, as these are the randomly allocated elements to which the between-group differences can be attributed. Thus this trial tells us about the effects of 30 minutes of treadmill training compared to 30 minutes of Bobath walking training.

The CAP summary included a clear description of the interventions, including the 30 min of Bobath walking training common to both groups. We felt this was sufficient to allow the correct interpretation of the heading and conclusion. The synopsis format summarises an extensive amount of material and we chose to emphasise the difference between the regimens in the title. It is not possible to provide complete descriptions of the treatment regimens in the brief titles we use for CAPs. That is why readers are encouraged to read the entire CAP summary.

**Mark Elkins**

*Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, CAP Editor*

**Anne Moseley**

*School of Physiotherapy, University of Sydney*

## Notice of Duplicate Publication

It has come to the attention of the Editorial Board that much of the paper published in the *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy* by Oldmeadow et al (2002) had been published previously in the *Journal of Quality in Clinical Practice* (Oldmeadow et al 2001). Neither the Editorial Board nor the Scientific Editor was aware of the earlier publication at the time the paper was published in the *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy*. When the paper was submitted to the *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy* the authors also submitted a copyright release statement to the editorial office that asserted:

*The author(s) further warrant(s) that his/her/their work has not been submitted in this or any other form for publication in any other journal.*

The Editorial Board regrets that duplicate publication has occurred. The duplicate publication is a disservice both to readers of the *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy* and of the *Journal of Quality in Clinical Practice*. (The *Journal of Quality in Clinical Practice* was discontinued in 2001.) The authors have tendered a written apology to the Editorial Board of the *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy*.

## References

- Oldmeadow LB, McBurney H and Robertson VJ (2002): Hospital stay and discharge outcomes after knee arthroplasty: Implications for physiotherapy practice. *Australian Journal of Physiotherapy* 48: 117–121.
- Oldmeadow LB, McBurney H and Robertson VJ (2001): Hospital stay and discharge outcomes after knee arthroplasty. *Journal of Quality in Clinical Practice* 21: 56–60.